

## REGISTER OF CLASSIFICATION DECISIONS

Date of entry in Register: 22 September 2000  
Name of applicant/court: The District Court at Auckland  
Applicant to the Labelling Body: Not Applicable  
Title of Publication: Mantalk February 1997  
Other Known Titles: Mantalk February 1997 Volume 6, Number 2  
Director: Not Applicable  
Producer: Not Applicable  
Publisher: FirstHand Ltd  
Editor: Nick Roberts  
Format: Magazine  
Country of Origin: USA  
Language: English

.....

**Components of film originally examined:** Not Applicable.

Feature:	Running time:
Trailers:	Running time:
	Total Running time:

Excision/Alteration: Not Applicable.

Reason(s) for Excision:

Not Applicable.

... Please turn over

Classification Decision:

Objectionable.

Display Conditions:

Not Applicable.

Descriptive Note:

Not Applicable.

.....

Direction to issue a label has been given on: Not Applicable.

.....

**SUMMARY OF THE REASONS FOR DECISION:**

The publication entitled *Mantalk February 1997* is classified as:  
Objectionable.

The publication is a magazine focusing on sexual activity between men. There is a particular focus on bondage and sado masochistic activity. The magazine promotes and supports the use of urine in association with sexual conduct. There are several references to this activity made through the magazine in a manner which presents the activity as pleasurable and sexually arousing. The magazine is therefore deemed objectionable in terms of s3(2) of the Films, Videos, and Publications Classification Act 1993 (FVPC Act). In addition, the magazine contains text describing sexual activity between family members in a manner intended to be sexually arousing and intended to legitimise such a relationship.

The application of the deeming provisions of s3(2) of the FVPC Act places limits on freedom of expression. For the reasons given above, the Classification Office is confident that its interpretation and application of the statutory criteria are reasonable and demonstrably justified. The result of a publication falling within the criteria of s3(2) is prescribed by law, in accord with Parliament's intention that publications to which s3(2) criteria apply should be banned.

OFLC Ref: 1077